DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 835 JC 010 109

TITLE	Austin Community College Eight-Week Course Feedback Survey: First Eight-Week Session, Fall 1998.
INSTITUTION	Austin Community Coll., TX.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	47p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://ww2.austin.cc.tx.us/oiepub/publications.htm.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Class Organization; Community Colleges; Course Selection (Students); Evaluation Methods; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Participant Satisfaction; *Pretests Posttests; Program Evaluation; School Schedules; Student Surveys; Teacher Surveys; Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Austin Community College TX

ABSTRACT

Pre- and post-course surveys of faculty and students participating in 8-week format courses at Austin Community College (ACC) in fall 1998 yielded the following recommendations: (1) offer more 8-week classes at more locations and class times; (2) build in class meetings to compensate for any time lost to holidays; (3) piggy-back, in the first and second 8-week sessions, basic (prerequisite) courses with their advanced course counterpart and assign the same instructor for both courses where possible; (4) provide instructors choice and more "lead time" to prepare for teaching in this format; (5) share data with students to help them decide whether to select courses in this format; (6) conduct further study to determine specifically which courses are inappropriate for this format and determine whether modifications to curriculum might be indicated; and (7) vary class presentations--include student participation and hands-on learning activities and provide a comprehensive syllabus on the first class day. This study suggests that the 8-week format is appropriate for some students, some faculty, and some courses; perhaps success is determined by the mix. Includes 8-week course listings, student enrollment figures, grade distribution, survey questions, comments, and summary of results. Contains 26 tables. (PGS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Austin Community College
Eight-Week Course Feedback Survey
First Eight-Week Session
Fall 1998

ED 448 835

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Oburn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC010109

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Austin Community College
Eight-Week Course Feedback Survey
First Eight-Week Session
Fall 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the Fall 1998 semester, Austin Community College offered courses in an 8-week format. An assessment of the first session courses was conducted requesting feedback from students and faculty participating in these courses. A pre-course feedback questionnaire and a post-course feedback questionnaire was administered to students taking the courses and a faculty questionnaire was administered to faculty teaching the courses.

The results of this survey indicate the following recommendations.

- Offer more 8-week classes and offer them at more locations and class times.
- Build in class meetings to compensate for any time lost to holidays.
- Piggy-back, in the first and second 8-week sessions, basic (prerequisite) courses with their advanced course counterpart and assign the same instructor for both courses where possible.
- Provide instructors choice and more "lead time" to prepare for teaching in this format.
- Share data with students to help them decide whether to select courses in this format.
- Conduct further study to determine specifically which courses are inappropriate for this format and determine whether modifications to curriculum might be indicated.
- For faculty teaching 8-week courses:
  - Schedule breaks during class for courses that meet longer than two hours at a time.
  - Vary class presentations--include student participation and hands-on learning activities.
  - Be well prepared and well organized.
  - Provide a comprehensive syllabus on the first class day.

This study suggests ACC should offer more 8-week classes, and it suggests the format is appropriate for *some* students, *some* faculty, and *some* courses; perhaps success is determined by the mix. As with all courses, faculty, deans, program coordinators, advisors and counselors each play a part in "putting together courses"--scheduling classes, assigning instructors, designing curriculum, and assisting students with class selection. Each of these tasks is a particularly important part of "putting together" the 8-week courses. The right mix leads to success for students and satisfaction for faculty, and provides the community expanded access to educational opportunities.

Fall Semester First Eight-Week Session Survey Results

INTRODUCTION

Many community colleges around the country have begun to offer courses in non-traditional instructional formats, such as video television and internet courses, and evening and weekend college programs, in response to their community's call for increased access to educational opportunities. In the fall of 1998, ACC expanded its non-traditional course offerings by adding courses in an eight-week format in twenty-four disciplines, from art to welding, and including history, government, foreign language, English, math, computer science, and developmental studies. These classes were "accelerated," and scheduled so that students could attend for 8-weeks, complete the same number of contact hours, and earn the same number of credit hours as in a 16-week semester course.

To assess the effectiveness of this new non-traditional course format, students in eight week semester classes were surveyed both at the beginning of the 8-week course and again at the conclusion of the course. Additionally, faculty were asked to provide feedback on their experiences in teaching in this format. The results of this survey would provide faculty and administrators information to ensure successful educational experiences for students.

Part I of this report will present the results of the student survey; Part II will present the results of the faculty survey. Part III will provide supplemental data (course listings, enrollments and grade distributions for **all** 8-week courses offered in the fall semester).

PART I: Student Feedback on the 8-Week Course Survey

The student survey was designed to answer the following questions:

- ***Who enrolled in the 8-week session courses?***
- ***Why did they enroll in this course format?***
- ***What were their expectations and experiences of the 8-week course?***
- ***How did they do?***
- ***Did students enroll in the following 8-week session?***

METHODOLOGY

Survey Administration: Two questionnaires were designed to collect student feedback data on 8-week semester courses, a *Before 8-week Course Feedback* questionnaire to be completed during the first week of the class and an *After 8-week Course Feedback* questionnaire to be completed during the last week of the class. Faculty distributed questionnaires to their students to complete during class time and returned the completed questionnaires to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for analysis.

Instrument: Each questionnaire consisted of a set of 14 or more reasons students might select for taking the 8-week course, a set of demographic data items, and a set of statements describing students' expectations (*Before* questionnaire) or experience (*After* questionnaire) of the course, with which students indicated their level of agreement: strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree. (See Appendix A)

Survey Population: The survey population consisted of students in 39 (49.4%) of the 79 course sections offered in the first 8-week term of Fall 1998. Students in at least one section of each course offered, accounting, art, biology, commercial art, computer information systems, computer science, developmental math, developmental reading, developmental writing, economics, electronics, English, engineering design graphics, French, German, government, health and kinesiology, history, management,

math, psychology, sociology, speech, Spanish, and travel, were surveyed. All campuses where an 8-week course was taught, every meeting time (morning, middle of the day, and evening) and meeting format (twice/week, four times/week, once/week, three times/week, five times/week, Saturdays, and week days) were represented in the 39 sections selected.

RESULTS

Return Rate: Of the 39 selected sections, 22 returned both the *Before* and *After 8-Week Course Feedback* questionnaires, an overall return rate of 56.4 percent. The return rate for *Before* questionnaires *only* was 61.5 percent (24 of 39 sections). The return rate for *After* questionnaires *only* was 91.7 percent (22 of the 24 sections). The *After* questionnaires were sent only to students in those sections that had completed the *Before 8-Week Course Feedback* questionnaire. Four hundred sixteen students completed the *Before* questionnaire and 272 students completed the *After* questionnaire.

Who enrolled in the 8-week courses? *Based on the responses to both the Before and After questionnaires, the greatest percentage of the students who enrolled in an 8-week semester course in Fall 1998*

- *Were between the ages of 17 - 21 years old*
- *Had earned 36 or more credit hours to date from ACC and/or other colleges*
- *Attended classes at ACC primarily in the daytime*
- *Were employed part or full time*
- *Were enrolled in 12 - 14 credit hours in Fall 1998, including the 8-week semester course and*
- *Were NOT concurrently attending another college or university.*

Respondent groups were identified by age, employment status, current number of credit hours enrolled in for Fall 1998, total credit hours earned through Summer 1998, Fall 1998 primary class meeting times, and current co-enrollment in another institution, including high school. The tables below, which display the groups for both the *Before* and *After* questionnaires, demonstrate little difference in the two groups even though the number of respondents is different.

Table 1: Age The greatest percentage of respondents both to the *Before* and to the *After* questionnaires were students in the 17-21 age group.

Table 1: Respondents Grouped by Age

Age Categories	*Before* Questionnaire		*After* Questionnaire	
	N=416	%	N=272	%
17-21	179	43.0%	104	38.2%
22-29	141	33.9%	98	36.0%
30-49	86	20.7%	64	23.5%
50 and older	9	2.2%	6	2.2%
no response	1	0.2%	0	0%

Table 2: Employment Status Slightly more than three-fourths (75.4% *Before* and 75.3% *After*) of all respondents were working while taking the 8-week course. The greatest proportion of these were working full time (43.0% *Before* and 41.9% *After*).

Table 2: Respondents Grouped by Employment Status

Employment Status	*Before* Questionnaire		*After* Questionnaire	
	N=416	%	N=272	%
Working part time	125	30.0%	86	31.6%
Working full time	179	43.0%	114	41.9%
Work part time in summers only	3	0.7%		
Work full time in summers only	3	0.7%	2	0.7%
Retired	1	0.2%		
Self-employed	9	2.2%	5	1.8%
Not employed but looking for work	32	7.7%	16	5.9%
Not employed and not looking for work	55	13.2%	39	14.3%
No response	9	2.2	10	3.7%

Table 3: Credit Hours for Fall 1998 Respondents taking 12-14 credit hours in Fall 1998 comprised almost a third of the survey population (30.0% *Before*, 30.5% *After*).

Table 3: Respondents Grouped by Credit Hours for Fall 1998

Credit Hours: Fall 1998	*Before* Questionnaire		*After* Questionnaire	
	N=416	%	N=272	%
1-2	4	1.0%	2	0.7%
3-5	56	13.5%	38	14.0%
6-8	71	17.1%	51	18.8%
9-11	78	18.8%	49	18.0%
12-14	125	30.0%	83	30.5%
15 or more	80	19.2%	45	16.5%
No response	2	0.5%	4	1.5%

Table 4: Total Credit Hours Earned The majority of students responding to the survey were experienced students; they had already earned from 21-36 or more credit hours before taking the 8-week course.

Table 4: Respondents Grouped by Total Credit Hours Earned Through Summer 1998

Total Credit Hours	*Before* Questionnaire		*After* Questionnaire	
	N=416	%	N=272	%
1-3	34	8.2%	5	1.8%
4-10	32	7.7%	11	4.0%
11-15	28	6.7%	21	7.7%
16-20	26	6.3%	11	4.0%
21-36	94	22.6%	63	23.2%
36 or more	144	34.6%	113	41.5%
None yet	Not on this questionnaire	N/A	40	14.7%
No response	58	13.9%	8	2.9%

Table 5: Co-Enrolled A positive response to the item of Co-enrollment at another institution while taking the 8-week course at ACC was given by 10.2 percent of the students completing the *Before* questionnaire.

This item was refined on the *After* questionnaire to allow the responses "No other college" and "High School." On the *After* questionnaire, 82.4 percent of the respondents reported not being enrolled in any other college.

Table 5: Respondents Grouped by Co-Enrollment

Co-enrolled at ACC and	*Before* Questionnaire		*After* Questionnaire	
	N=416	%	N=272	%
St. Edward's University	5	1.2%	1	0.4%
Southwest Texas State University	9	2.2%	8	2.9%
University of Texas	19	4.6%	9	3.3%
Other college not listed here	9	2.2%	2	0.7%
No other college	N/A	N/A	224	82.4%
No response	374	89.9%	28	10.3%

Why did they enroll in this course format? *The majority of students completing the Before questionnaire and the majority of students completing the After questionnaire cited the following reasons for taking a class in the 8-week semester format.*

- *I can take more courses in a single semester.*
- *I can complete a two course sequence in one semester.*
- *The 8-week course fits into my life/work schedule better than long semester courses do.*

Questionnaires listed up to 17 reasons students might mark for taking the 8-week course. Frequencies and percentages for marked reasons were tabulated. The reasons grouped around four main categories: more-in-less-time, scheduling convenience, short duration of the course, and preferred learning format.

Table 6: Reasons for Taking the 8-Week Course lists the reasons for taking the 8-week course, grouped by category, in descending rank order as reported by students on the *After* questionnaires (the students who actually completed the 8-week course). It displays the number and percent of students selecting that reason, and the rank, number and percent for the same reason on the *Before* questionnaire. No inferences can be made regarding change in reasons, however, since the respondents were not individually identified.

Table 6: Reasons for Taking an 8-Week Course

Reason	*Before* Questionnaire			*After* Questionnaire		
	Rank	N	%	Rank	N	%
More-in-Less-Time						
I can take more courses in a single semester.	1	249	59.9%	1	189	69.5%
I can complete a two course sequence in one semester.	3	190	45.7%	2	166	61.0%
I can start a course in the middle of the semester.	10	60	14.4%	7	92	33.8%
Scheduling Convenience						
The 8-week course fit into my life/work schedule better than the long semester courses did.	2	199	47.8%	3	165	60.7%
The 8-week course will be over before the holiday season begins.	8	83	20.0%	11	80	29.4%
I can take the 8-week course at ACC while I am enrolled at another college.	11	35	8.4%	13	36	13.2%
Preferred Learning Format						
I prefer the accelerated pace of the 8-week course.	4	138	33.2%	4	134	49.3%
I tend to "lose steam" as a semester progresses. Knowing the class ends in 8 weeks takes the pressure off.	Reason not listed on *Before* questionnaire			6	98	36.0%
I learn better when I can focus on fewer courses at a time.	5	124	29.8%	7	92	33.8%
I am likely to procrastinate if assignments are spaced at time intervals that are too wide.	Reason not listed on *Before* questionnaire			9	87	32.0%
Short Duration of the Course						
I can take a course that I am not really interested in, but that is required for my degree and "get it over with" quickly.	6	109	26.2%	5	113	41.5%
I can meet the requirements for developmental courses sooner.	7	92	22.1%	9	87	32.0%
I can "try out" a college course without investing my time in a long semester.	12	23	5.5%	14	24	8.8%
I can audit a course to "freshen up" without sitting through twice as many classes.	13	23	5.5%	14	24	8.8%
Miscellaneous						
The course I wanted to take was not available in the 16-week format.	9	64	15.4%	12	42	15.4%
My primary reason for taking an 8-week course is not listed here.	Reason not listed on *Before* questionnaire			16	17	6.3%
I wanted to take a class for personal enrichment (just for fun).	14	22	5.3%	17	16	5.9%

Clearly, the major reason students choose the 8-week course format is the opportunity to accomplish more in less time. The most often marked reason for taking the 8-week course, both on the *Before* questionnaire and the *After* questionnaire was "I can take more courses in a single semester." This reason was cited by 59.9 percent (249) of students completing the *Before* questionnaire and by 69.5 percent (189) of students completing the *After* questionnaire. "I can complete a two course sequence in one semester," was the second most cited reason for taking these courses (by 45.7 percent (190) of students completing the *Before* questionnaire and by 61.0 percent (166) of students completing the *After* questionnaire).

The high percentage of students selecting reasons from the "scheduling convenience" and "preferred learning format" categories perhaps indicates the type of student for whom this format is most attractive.

What were their expectations of the 8-week course? *The majority of students who completed the Before questionnaire expected*

- *the workload would be modified but not "watered down"*

- *to learn as much and spend as much time in preparation for the 8-week course as for 16-week courses*
- *to work twice as hard in the 8-week course as in a 16-week course*
- *to take another course in the second 8-week semester*
- *and wanted ACC to offer more 8-week courses.*

The *Before* questionnaire asked students to indicate their level of agreement with eight statements describing their expectations of the 8-week course, using the following scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=somewhat agree, and 4=strongly agree. Means were computed for responses to each statement.

Table 7: Responses to Expectation Statements on *Before* Questionnaire displays, in descending order of means, the level of agreement students reported with the *expectation* statements on the *Before* questionnaire. Means for each statement were within the "somewhat agree" range, and the highest average level of agreement was with the statement "I think ACC should offer more courses in the 8-week format."

Table 7: Responses to Expectation Statements on *Before* Questionnaire

Expectation statement	Strongly Disagree		Somewhat Disagree		Somewhat Agree		Strongly Agree		Mean*
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
I think ACC should offer more courses in the 8-week format.	11	2.6	26	6.3	108	26	259	62.3	3.52
I expect to learn as much in eight weeks as I could in 16 weeks.	8	1.9	32	7.7	159	38.2	210	50.5	3.40
I expect the instructor to modify the workload and course content to make it manageable in the 8-week format.	22	5.3	27	6.5	138	33.2	219	52.6	3.36
I am willing to work twice as hard to finish courses and/or my degree earlier.	12	2.9	34	8.2	162	38.9	195	46.9	3.34
I intend to take another course in the second 8-weeks.	42	10.1	35	8.4	90	21.6	240	57.7	3.30
I expect to spend as much time preparing for my 8-week class as I would preparing for a 16 week class.	28	6.7	47	11.3	125	30.0	206	49.5	3.25
I expect to work twice as hard for eight weeks to earn the same credit and learn the same content as offered in a 16-week semester.	23	5.5	48	11.5	190	45.7	146	35.1	3.13
I would NOT take an 8-week course if I thought it would be "Watered down" or offer me "less for my money" than equivalent 16-week courses.	33	7.9	61	14.7	131	31.5	176	42.3	3.12

*Strongly disagree=1, somewhat disagree=2, somewhat agree=3, strongly agree=4

What was their experience of the 8-week course? *The 8-week courses met students' expectations. The majority of students completing the After 8-week questionnaire indicated*

- *the workload and course content were manageable but not "watered down"*
- *they learned as much in the 8-week course*
- *they would not have made a higher grade in the 16-week version of the same course*
- *they spent as much time in preparation as they would have in a 16-week course*
- *preparation for the 8-week course took more time than they had expected it would*
- *they worked twice as hard in the 8-week course and felt it was worth it to complete courses, or their degree, earlier than in a 16-week semester.*

- *they intended to take another course in the second 8-week semester or future 8-week semesters*
- *they would recommend 8-week courses to other students*
- *they wanted ACC to offer more 8-week courses*

The *After* questionnaire asked students to indicate their level of agreement with 12 statements describing their *experience* of the 8-week course, using the same scale as the expectation statements. The experience statements included all of the expectation statements and four additional statements.

Table 8: Responses to Experience Statements on the *After* Questionnaire displays, in descending order of mean values, the level of agreement students reported with the experience statements on the *After* questionnaire.

Table 8: Responses to Experience Statements on the *After* Questionnaire

Experience Statement	Strongly Disagree		Somewhat Disagree		Somewhat Agree		Strongly Agree		Mean*
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
I think ACC should offer more courses in the 8-week format.	10	3.7	14	5.1	58	21.3	187	68.8	3.57
I would recommend 8-week courses to other students.	10	3.7	16	5.9	72	26.5	172	63.2	3.50
The 8-week course was not "watered down" nor did it offer me "less for my money" than equivalent 16-week semester courses.	10	3.7	28	10.3	71	26.1	161	59.2	3.42
I felt it was worth it to work twice as hard to finish courses and/or my degree earlier.	14	5.1	25	9.2	72	26.5	152	55.9	3.38
The workload and course content were manageable in the 8-week format.	12	4.4	32	11.8	98	36	130	47.8	3.27
I intend to take another course in the second 8-weeks.	39	14.3	33	12.1	44	16.2	146	53.7	3.13
I feel I learned as much in the 8-week course as I would have in the same course offered in a 16-week format.	28	10.3	42	15.4	73	26.8	126	46.3	3.10
I spent as much time preparing for my 8-week class as I would preparing for a 16-week class.	24	8.8	63	23.2	97	35.7	86	31.6	2.91
I do not intend to take another course in the second 8-weeks, but I would take other 8-week courses if they are offered in the spring.	53	19.5	29	10.7	57	21	103	37.9	2.87
I worked twice as hard for eight weeks to earn the same credit and learn the same content as offered in a 16-week semester.	20	7.4	65	23.9	116	42.6	66	24.3	2.85
The 8-week course took more preparation time than I expected.	32	11.8	81	29.8	105	38.6	54	19.9	2.67
I feel that I would have made a higher grade in the course if I had taken it in the 16-week format.	91	33.5	71	26.1	59	21.7	46	16.9	2.22

*Strongly disagree=1, somewhat disagree=2, somewhat agree=3, strongly agree=4

Students' overall experience of this course format was positive. As with the expectation statements, the experience statement with the highest mean value was, "I think ACC should offer more courses in the 8-week format." Over two thirds of the students completing the course indicated they strongly agreed with this statement.

What do you feel are the top three benefits and drawbacks of the 8-week courses? The *After* questionnaire requested that students list three benefits and drawbacks of the format. Responses to this

and other open-ended items that follow were analyzed qualitatively and are summarized below. Representative student comments are listed verbatim.

Overall, comments reflected students' mature perception of their own learning needs.

The good... The "benefits" comments revealed many students who participated in the survey were goal oriented and willing to work to achieve those goals. They appreciated the "support" the 8-week format offered toward that end. Predominate "benefits" themes in these comments were the following:

Flexibility of scheduling work or travel

- Because I have to travel a lot, now I can travel and still not skip a whole semester
- Allows for flexible schedule around work for self-employed worker as myself.

Completing degree, transfer institution, or developmental course requirements quickly

- the short time ..helped me complete course so I am not under a transfer deadline.
- Helps keep required developmental courses from holding up graduation.
- Ability to finish degree faster.
- I can fulfill a 30-hour requirement for transfer to SWT in quicker time.

Providing "focus" compared to the "long" semester,

- You don't only learn a little at a time and you get to go through the whole chapter usually in one class so you understand it better when it is not broken up so much.
- Better sense of accomplishment knowing each class is going to be productive.

The accelerated pace of the class

- The accelerated work load makes me not get bored.
- I stayed motivated knowing it would be over in 8 weeks.
- It was fast-paced and didn't allow me to fall into a slump
- Complete [ENG] Comp I & II in one semester
- You can eliminate prerequisite courses without waiting for a whole semester passing you by. This semester I wanted to take a LAN class but needed the Intro to Data Com class to take it. Instead of waiting an entire semester I was able to maximize it by enrolling in the Data Com class the first 8 weeks then enrolling in the LAN I class the next 8 weeks.
- Four days a week for a language really helped--constant exposure was good.

...The Bad... Many students said there were no drawbacks of this format. Comments of students who did express drawbacks of this format, revealed many of the students felt the pressure of the condensed time frame. The major drawbacks they identified were focused on time--especially the lack of it.

Predominate "drawback" themes are listed below:

No disadvantages

- Nothing, nada, nil.
- None that I can think of at this time. I prefer an accelerated schedule.
- None, I love the 8-week course.
- None really, I think it's a good idea.

Time required to keep up with the workload

- You need to be able to spend more time out of class studying.
- Less preparation time for classes when working full time.
- Less free time

Amount of work involved

- Lots of papers and assignments are due very close together.
- More study time is required per week
- You have to stay on top of things, there's no room for slacking off.
- Some students aren't prepared or disciplined for the amount of attention required to meet the 8-week course needs.
- Intense working and learning.

Danger of skipping one class or falling behind—there is no catch up time available

- If you miss a class it's like missing three days.
- One holiday took out a whole week of class material
- If you fall behind, you probably won't make it.

Compressed exam schedule

- Exams everyday.
- Have to spend more time preparing for exams at a pressured time limit than 16-week courses.
- Intense level of testing.

Accelerated pace of the course

- Work was tough because so condensed.
- Less time for finishing papers.
- Less time to digest information.
- The fast pace is not for everyone.
- Can't get too in-depth into subject matter.
- Leaves less research time between classes.
- Less time to discuss/debate issues more in-depth.
- You can't take this class if you are a procrastinator.

Concern whether learning would be retained.

- ...didn't have time to soak in--took me longer to know what I've learned.
- More focus on concepts rather than application.
- Not enough time to do more dialogue/speaking. [foreign language course]

Not enough time for establishing relationships with other students and with the instructor,

- Less time to develop teacher-student interaction.
- Less time to know students.
- Less time spent in classroom socialization.

Long hours in class

- Have to see the same people everyday.
- Unusual time schedule of the class.
- Long hours in the evening, hard to keep attention focused.
- The classes are three hours long, so if the teacher is boring you might fall asleep.

Took time from their 16-week course preparation.

- Study revolves around the class, you forget about your 16-week classes.
- Less concentration on other 16-week classes
- Leaves little time for other classes.

Not appropriate for some classes

- Some courses are too difficult and broad to study in only 8 weeks.
- Probably good for some lecture courses, but not enough time for very computer-intensive courses.
- I really like the class and my teacher, but I think it's totally illogical and just plain stupid to think you can cram a history class into 8 weeks. It may work for some classes, but not for history.
- For the short period, it may be too much of a transition if the instructor is not committed for both parts. The pace of the class is too fast to change styles in what seems to be midway. (language class)

...And Other. The final item of the *After* questionnaire asked students to "...add other comments you feel are important regarding the 8-week course." The predominate tone of these comments was very positive.

Their appreciation of the 8-week course faculty and the high quality of instruction

- [Instructor's name] is an Awesome instructor.
- [Instructor's name] provided excellent information and related the subject matter in an understandable and practical way.
- The instructor kept the class interesting and the class members challenged. I would enjoy taking another class from the instructor because he is knowledgeable about his subject matter.

Their gratitude to the College for offering the courses

- The 8-week courses being offered at night was a godsend because I was able to attend UT and ACC concurrently with no scheduling conflicts.
- Thank you for adding these courses.
- This was the best choice I could have made this semester. I am very satisfied. Thanx.
- I work full time and can usually take only 2 classes during the evenings each long semester. Being able to concentrate on only one course each half semester makes it easier to stay up with the course load.
- This format can certainly benefit students who are trying to get through college and into the REAL world as quickly as possible.

Their enjoyment of the courses

- I prefer this 8-week course mainly because it fit into my schedule. I prefer to be motivated to learn--would not be if this course was drawn out over 16 weeks. I have been through many years and hours of courses and know what it takes to keep my interest. 16 weeks would not.
- 8-week courses are wonderful. I would like to take as many as I can. The more credits I can earn in a semester, the better.
- I really enjoyed this class despite the stress of coming so often and having such a short time to learn so very much.

Their requests for more courses

- I would like to see more computer courses offered in 8-week format, especially as people try to change/adapt their job skills for Austin's fast-paced, high-tech workplace.
- Please add more! I get more useful info. here than I did at UT.

On balance, there were negative comments; some students did not like the 8-week courses and would not take them again. Other comments indicated some students took the 8-week course "accidentally" or only because the course they needed was not available in the 16-week format. And some students reiterated their desire for classes at more locations.

- I think that an 8-week class would be more beneficial if we went everyday instead of just two days a week. I would retain the knowledge better. It would be better if they were not 2 hrs. and 50 min. long. I sometimes get antsy while sitting for long periods of time. I liked the classes in the summer that were everyday for an hour and a half long. I think it would also be easier on the professors not to have to lecture for three hours.
- I did not know that this was an 8-week [class] and I don't endorse, nor would I recommend an 8-week course to anyone I know.
- I wish this course was offered at Rio Grande! It's such a hassle to drive from central Austin to NRG.
- This was the only class offered during the time period that I needed for my assoc. degree.
- This 8-week is too fast for a computer class (beginning Cobol).

How did the students do in the 8-week courses? *Students in the 8-week semester courses did very well. Seventy-five percent of students completed the 8-week course with a grade of C or better. Students taking the 8-week semester courses persist in these courses at a much greater rate than in some other course formats. Compared to withdrawal rates for other course formats, the withdrawal rate for the 8-week semester courses was* ***below*** *the college-wide average withdrawal rate.*

Table 9: Grade Distribution for Surveyed Sections displays the grade distribution for students in the twenty-two 8-week course sections that returned the *After* questionnaire--all but two sections, which did not have grades posted at the time the data was extracted from the ACC database. The withdrawal rate (a ratio of grades of W divided by the total number of all possible grades) for this group of students was 13.9 percent; the college-wide credit course average withdrawal rate is 20.5 percent, a difference of 6.6 percent.

Table 9: Grade Distribution for Surveyed Sections

Grade	N	%
A	109	32.2%
B	99	29.3%
C	46	13.6%
D	7	2.1%
F	19	5.6%
W	46	13.6%
I	11	3.3%
AU	2	0.6%

Source: ACC Database

Did they enroll in the following 8-week session? *ACC database data indicate 48.1 percent of the surveyed first 8-week course session students, subsequently enrolled in the second 8-week session. Additionally, 78.2 percent of all students enrolled in the first 8-week session also enrolled in the following session.*

Of the 223 students who completed the *After* questionnaire, 190 (69.9%) agreed to some degree with the statement, " I intend to take another course in the second 8-week format." ACC database data indicate that 207 (48.1%) of the students in surveyed sections were enrolled in a second 8-week course. Of the 647 students who took any first 8-week session, 506 (78.2%) enrolled in the second 8-week session.

Additionally, 820 students who were not enrolled in the first 8-week session enrolled in the second session, an increase of 26.7 percent over the number enrolled in the first 8-week session.

CONCLUSION

The majority of students who participated in this survey appear to be

- Goal oriented
- Hard-working
- Motivated
- Action oriented
- Impatient
- And easily bored.

The accelerated course work and shortened time frame of the 8-week courses appealed not only to their learning styles, but also to their "fast track" orientation to goal achievement.

Part II: Faculty Feedback on Fall First 8-Week Session Courses

A survey of faculty teaching the 8-week courses was conducted concurrently with the survey of students taking these courses. The *8-Week Course Survey Faculty Questionnaire* was designed to provide a "picture" of the experience of faculty teaching in the 8-week format. Results would answer the following questions:

- ***What did faculty expect going into the 8-week format?***
- ***What surprises or challenges did they encounter?***
- ***How did they adapt their approach to teaching the 8-week format?***
- ***What did they do to teach students learning methods to help them succeed in this format?***
- ***What significantly enhanced or inhibited learning in this course format?***
- ***Was there a difference in the amount of "activity" in these courses?***
- ***Compared to students in 16-week courses, was there a difference in the development of knowledge and skills of the 8-week course students?***
- ***How stressful was this teaching format compared to a 16-week format?***
- ***Would they teach in this format again?***

METHODOLOGY

Survey Administration: A faculty questionnaire was sent with the *After* questionnaires for students, to each instructor of the 24 sections returning the *Before 8-Week Course Feedback* questionnaires completed by students.

Instrument: The faculty questionnaire requested faculty share their experience and observations of teaching in this format. The questionnaire consisted of ten items, five of which were open ended. Along with asking for the instructor's expectations of the 8-week format and surprises they encountered, the open ended items asked how the 8-week course teaching experience was different from the 16-week course in terms of challenges faculty faced, adaptations they made, and methods they used to help students learn in this new format. Other items asked faculty to indicate differences between the 8- and 16-week courses in the level of student classroom activities and performance. Two additional questions requested faculty indicate how stressful teaching the course was and whether they were willing to teach in this format again. (See Appendix B.)

Survey Population: The survey population consisted of faculty teaching 8-week courses in the 24 sections that returned the *Before 8-Week Course Feedback* student questionnaire. Disciplines represented in this population included art, biology, commercial art, computer information systems, developmental math, developmental reading, developmental writing, economics, English, French, German, government, history, math, speech, and Spanish.

RESULTS

Return Rate: Nineteen of 24 faculty (four full time, 15 adjunct) returned a completed *8-Week Course Survey Faculty Questionnaire,* a return rate of 79.2 percent.

What were your expectations going into the 8-week format? Most of the expectations faculty expressed were concerns about the demanding pace of teaching and learning in the shortened time frame. Faculty expected the 8-week course format to place more demands on them:

- I was a little anxious I wouldn't be able to provide my students with the same level/quality of information and time to process and apply that information. I thought or expected to run out of time before the end of 8 weeks and I'd still be on chapter 4 or so.
- That it would be exhausting lecturing four times a week.
- A lot of work to cover the desired course content.
- To be extremely rushed.
- Too much material....too little time.
- Like summer school--lots of concentrated work and a need to try to motivate students to keep up, do reading, attend class every day.

They expected the format to be difficult for their students:

- I thought it would be harder for students.
- I was NOT excited about teaching an 8-week course. I felt the long class periods and amount of work/assignments would be difficult for my students.
- That the pace would be rushed and that only better-prepared students with relatively lax schedules and few outside responsibilities should attempt it.
- Larger drop out rate (more than 50%).
- That this would be successful if the students were committed and prepared for the heavy workload.

A few faculty, however, expected the 8-week format to be not much different than the 16-week format or the short summer format.

- Same as 12 or 16 week format.
- Not much different than the "short" summer session--right? I wasn't expecting anything "out of the ordinary."
- I expected students to complete the same amount of work as my 16-week classes.

And one instructor didn't know what to expect:

- It was hard to know what to expect as we were given no materials to help us cope with teaching a face paced course like this.

What surprises or challenges did you encounter? Faculty were "pleasantly" surprised when what they had expected did not happen. Most of the responses expressed surprise that this format worked better than they thought it would.

Faculty were surprised they liked the 8-week course format more than they expected:

- I have enjoyed the 8-week course. The course flowed well and was not fragmented. Before one chapter took two class periods, [in the 8-week course]I could finish without review from one class to the next.
- I got used to the momentum of the class. My other 16-week class seems to move too slowly. Student retention of material seems better.

They were surprised by the students in their 8-week classes:

- A surprise was that the students I ended up with (after the dust settled and those who weren't up to the challenge dropped) were excellent students--not all A's, but capable, hard-working, and with good attitudes.
- Same as 12 or 16 week format except different retention rate.
- Only 35% drop out!
- All students work full time. Consequently, they have little time. They do not put the required time into their studies. Finish quickly is more important than what you retain.

- Two students said they didn't know they had enrolled in an 8-week course. One asked to be moved to a 16-week class. Two students for the second 8-week class showed up because they were not aware they had enrolled in an 8-week class.

And several instructors said there were no surprises teaching in this format:

- None really, I've had lots of 8-week classes.

Most of the challenges reported in response to this item were about time--maintaining student attention for the length of the class meeting, recognizing student problems for referral to counselors or learning labs quickly, covering the course material in the allotted time, staying on schedule, and outside demands on student time. Challenge comments included the following:

- Challenges!! Well, I worried I wouldn't be able to identify students having problems early enough and direct the students to appropriate help (counselor, learning lab, etc.). One worry without merit. I was concerned I wouldn't be able to learn all the students' names quickly. It's a small thing I pride myself on--again a problem that never materialized.
- Keeping students' interest (not having them go to sleep!) for such a long class period. Attention spans are short even for adults! This class was over lunch and they had to eat. So I had to factor in breaks for nourishment.
- It was very difficult to maintain student morale and interest during two hours and 40 minutes class sessions.
- The challenge was to cover in 8 weeks what is normally covered in 16 weeks. This was also a challenge for the students. We did it right.
- I knew it was going to be a challenge to get and keep [the student's] attention, but I was not fully prepared for the zombie stares.
- Challenge to stay on track/on time schedule. Lack of planning by HBC. Students could not do course evaluation on-line. Several tried and did not show up as registered for course.
- It was very difficult to maintain student morale and interest during 2 hour and 40 minute class sessions. Most students had absolutely no concept of the extra demands being placed on them by the 8-week format.

One instructor was challenged by a publisher-changed text: "The publisher changed the edition of the text with major revisions and different plates during the summer. So I was trying to absorb and adapt lectures and visuals to the new book during a new schedule format. Very frustrating and stressful."

How did you adapt your approach to teaching for the 8-week format? Many faculty adapted their approach to teaching in several ways.

They adapted their presentations:

- I was better organized for sure.
- Gave more breaks.
- Had to give a break at every class--which took 10-20 minutes from lecture.
- Breaks every hour.
- Was a bit more structured than usual.

They adapted testing procedures:

- I had to reduce the time expectations of the oral exam because there was so much less time to do it in.
- All exams were given in the testing center. This was a terrible strain on the testing center--who were wonderful--but the only way an 8-week class can function. I never give exams in the testing center--except for make up--in a 16-week class.

- Taught to the tests.
- Quiz daily.

They adapted the course material:

- Lowered total chapters of text covered from 16 (planned) to 12 actual. However, also plan to do the same for 16-week format.
- Cut assignments without cutting content.
- I cut about 20% of material that I usually cover.
- I eliminated some of the coursework, but in retrospect, we could have done more.
- I had to eliminate some extra readings and cultural material.
- I "cut out" some class exercises that better identified theories. I found myself pushing student comprehension a little.

And they adapted the types of assignments they made:

- Gave more hands on/in-class labs to keep them active and alert. Had them work in small groups.
- I gave more in-class time on writing the actual papers than I usually do.
- Instead of a paper, I assigned students in-class, informal presentations of material. This allowed me a few minutes to catch my breath.
- I incorporated more peer teaching.
- I still had time for my class volunteer community project--the students just had to get it together as a group faster.

Describe what you did to teach students learning methods to help them succeed in this format. Responses to this question fell into three basic categories: Nothing, Faculty Behaviors, and Student Behaviors.

Some faculty felt the methods necessary for students to succeed in this format were the same as for the 16-week courses or a matter of time management. Below are representative examples of these comments:

- Nothing different. I always try to give my students helpful hints for studying foreign language because studying a foreign language is very different from studying other courses.
- No different than a 16-week [course]. I re-emphasized due dates, short time frame for assignments to keep them on track.
- I don't know what learning methods need to be different. It's mainly a time management problem.
- I can't give them more time, and that was what they needed to retain material.
- In 8 weeks!

Some faculty provided structural and organizational aids to assist students in being successful.

- I held extra office hours and workshop sessions to give them extra one-on-one attention. I also gave specific deadlines for rough draft so students could more easily gauge their progress.
- Gave them reviews before each test and encouraged them to see me during office hours with questions.
- I helped them focus on the most relevant material. I didn't want them to be so overwhelmed they would give up, so I provided a clear structure, gave study guides and outlined lectures. They appreciated this. No one seemed overwhelmed. Only one student dropped.
- Gave very comprehensive syllabus at first class. Reviewed and revised it periodically throughout course.
- Strict adherence to deadlines. Reading assignments well in advance.

One instructor, teaching a class wherein students learn negotiation skills, used the "tight" schedule of the 8-week format as an opportunity for students to practice these skills:

- My students learn to negotiate in this class and model democracy in decision-making situations. We changed some time lines in the 8 weeks, student initiated changes, that did NOT detract from the overall course.

Some faculty stressed student behaviors that lead to success.

- Made them aware that course is twice as intensive and that they would need to allow more [study] time for course.
- Told them they needed to read daily--we were covering a chapter a class.
- They just needed to be more focused and organized--stressed this.
- An emphasis on attendance and punctuality. Required certain materials (3-ring binder, dividers, lined paper, etc.) to facilitate organization. Urged repeatedly for them to keep up with assignments.
- Everything is based on homework. That's the bottom line. Success w/homework = success w/quizzes = test success = final exam [success]. The correlation was high--those who kept up with the homework finished with better grades.
- I stressed students focus on their essays because 50% of their grade was based on essay revision
-

Describe any aspects of the 8-week course experience that significantly enhanced student learning. Half the instructors completing the questionnaire either made no response to this item or responded there were none. The other half listed several aspects of their courses that significantly enhanced student learning.

The fact that the class met daily was listed several times. Instructors felt this enhanced students' retention of the course material, especially in the foreign language courses:

- In foreign language, it is good to keep the students using their skills daily; ultimately they should retain it better.
- The continuity of meeting four times a week allowed [students] to retain material for exams since they were closely spaced to one another.
- Hearing the language each day.

The fast pace of the course was also seen as an enhancement to student learning:

- Fast pace--no down time.
- Students seemed to like the pace better--it moved along smoothly.

Other enhancements to student learning in this format included the following:

- Student presentations and hands-on labs.
- Focus! Students were able to "zoom in" on significant information. In comparison, the longer 16-week students meander and wander before seeking additional help or information.
- [Students]could see from the beginning, the "light at the end of the tunnel" and this kept many focused and working hard.
- Longer classes allow more time to concentrate on the topics.
- Being in a computer classroom that has a set of tables [at which] to meet.
- Having a small class size.

Describe any ways in which student learning was significantly inhibited in the 8-week format. Instructors listed several ways in which student learning was inhibited; most of these were related to time in some way. And some of the factors inhibiting learning were also factors faculty listed as enhancing learning.

The pace of the course and the unforgiving nature of the schedule were listed most frequently:

- Course went too fast for some students.
- There was no time for ideas to develop when the brainstorming and rough drafting sessions had to occur on the same day.
- They [students] didn't feel they had enough time to read all assignments or prepare for a test as in 16 weeks.
- Couldn't assign the type of written papers I wished. Too little time to expect students to write papers.
- High pace/tempo--long time to keep up the pace without losing the edge. Takes more determination and effort by all, including instructor.
- For this course, 8 weeks is just not enough time. Had to cut too many corners.
- Monday holiday meant one week gone!
- If [students] missed one session, they were behind. However, I had a much lower rate of absences. In 16-week course it is much higher.
- The pace is unforgiving. I had a couple of students who were out a week due to illness and they were never able to catch up.
- It's only a problem if you are out or fall behind--don't really have the chance to catch up.

Other ways in which faculty felt student learning was inhibited included the following:

- I do not recommend this for students who have never had a foreign language before unless they have lots of free time and are highly motivated. This should be stressed when students are being advised by counselors as to what courses to take.
- This course is good as a review course, but difficult for students who never had German. Students can't remember material from one chapter to another. I can ask questions and speak German all day, but can they answer?
- Too little time to assimilate.
- These 8-week courses are not ideal for students prone to procrastination, or those with language acquisition, writing, or reading challenges. Some class discussions were shortened!!

Was there a difference in the amount of "activity" in your 8-week course? The faculty questionnaire asked faculty to compare the 8-week course with the 16-week course on six types of student activity. The majority of faculty reported no difference in the amount of each of the student activities. Table 10 displays the results of this item.

Table 10: Student Activity in 8-Week Course compared with 16-Week Course

Activity	Student Activity in 8-Week Format Compared to 16-Week Format					
	More		About the Same		Less	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Number of Assignments			13	76.5%	4	23.5%
Amount of reading			13	76.5%	3	17.6%
Amount of writing			13	76.5%	3	17.6%
Number of topics presented	1*	5.9 %	12	70.6%	4	23.5%
Number of exams			13	76.5%	2	11.8%
Amount of critical analysis of material			9	52.9%	6	35.3%

*Added topics were a result of a change in the text.

Compared to students in 16-week courses, was there a difference in the development of knowledge and skills of the 8-week course students? The item asked about development in five basic skill areas generally accepted as part of general education. Responses were relatively consistent across skill areas. However, faculty were divided on this item. Half or more of the faculty who gave a response, reported the 8-week students did as well as, or better than, the 16-week course students (50.0% - 69.2%), and slightly less than half responded the students did worse in developing the identified skills. One instructor commented that, in general, skill level improvement varied from student to student based on his/her commitment to learning.

Table 11: 8-Week Skill Development Compared to 16-Week

Skill Area	Development of Skills							
	Better		As Well		Worse		N/A	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Writing			6	37.5%	6	37.5%	4	25.0%
Problem solving	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	5	29.4%	4	23.5%
Critical analysis	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	6	35.3%	3	17.5%
Acquisition of knowledge	1	5.9%	8	47.1%	8	47.1%		
Application/integration of information throughout the course	1	5.9%	8	47.1%	8	47.1%		

How stressful was this teaching format compared to a 16-week format? Ten of the 18 faculty responding to this item (55.5%), felt this teaching format was about equally stressful as a 16-week format course, while three (16.7%) felt the format was less stressful and five (27.8%) reported this format was more stressful. The average of all responses was 4.78 (slightly above the mid-point on a scale of one = much less stressful, through seven = much more stressful).

Table 12: How stressful was this teaching format compared to a 16-week format?

Level of stress	N	%
1 Much less stressful	1	5.6%
2	1	5.6%
3	1	5.6%
4	4	22.2%
5	6	33.3%
6	1	5.6%
7 Much more stressful	4	22.2%
Total	18	100.0%
Mean	4.78	

Would you teach in this format again? A majority of faculty responding (72.2%), answered this item in the affirmative. One respondent commented "Hey, I enjoyed it too."

Table 13: Would you teach in this format again?

Response	N	%
Yes	13	72.2%
No	4	22.2%
Maybe	1	5.6%
Total	18	100.0%

CONCLUSION

Data gathered from faculty participating in the *8-Week Course Feedback* survey lead to the following observations:

- Faculty response to the 8-week format was predominately positive overall.
- The format seemed to lead to innovations in teaching approaches.
- The format seemed to be more appropriate for some courses than others.
- Generally, faculty felt students did as well in the 8-week format as in a 16-week format
- The format required more work and was more stressful for instructors than the 16-week course; however, most of the surveyed faculty would teach in the 8-week course format again.

Part III: 8-Week Format Courses Supplemental Data Fall 1998

A. Course Listings for All Fall Semester 8-Week Courses

B. Faculty Teaching 8-Week Courses

C.. Student Enrollment, Section Counts and Average Section Size by Campus

D. Grade Distribution for All Fall Semester 8-Week Courses

Course Listings for All Fall Semester 8-Week Courses

First 8-Week Session	Second 8-Week Session
"Paired Classes"	
Principles of Financial Accounting	Principles of Managerial Accounting
Art History I	Art History II
Fundamentals of Programming	Introduction to C++ and C Programming
Cobol Programming I	Cobol Programming II
Introduction to Data Communications	Lan Hardware and Software I
Introductory Java Programming	Intermediate Java Programming
Personal Computing	Advanced Personal Computing
Pre-algebra	Elementary Algebra
Intermediate Algebra	College Algebra
Reading Skills I	Reading Skills II
Writing Skills I	Writing Skills II
Writing Skills II	English Composition I
Principles of Microeconomics	Principles of Macroeconomics
Technical Drafting	Basic computer Aided Drafting
Semiconductor Manufacturing Technology	Semiconductor Manufacturing Technology II
English Composition I	English Composition II
French I	French II
United States Government	Texas State and Local Government
Texas State and Local Government	United States Government
United States History I	United States History II
Spanish I	Spanish II
Introduction to Travel and Tourism	Travel Operations I
Not Paired Classes	
Commercial Art History	Commercial Art History
Human Nutrition	Portfolio Development
Introduction to Multimedia	Introduction to Computers
Output Media Development	Personal Computing
Elementary Algebra	United States History I
English Composition II	Aqua Fitness
United States History II	Introduction to Humanities
Aqua Fitness	Principles of Management
Introduction to Business	College Algebra
Mathematics: Its Spirit and Use	Introduction to Psychology
Introduction to Psychology	Human Sexuality
Introduction to Speech Communication	Introduction to Sociology
Fundamentals of Public Speaking	Interpersonal Communication
Destinations USA	Travel and Tourism Sales and Mktg. Techniques
Welding Processes	

Faculty Teaching 8-Week Courses
Fall 1998

Faculty	First 8-Week Session		Second 8-Week Session		All 8-Week Sessions	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full Time	22	32.4%	27	35.1%	49	33.8%
Adjunct	46	67.6%	48	62.3%	94	64.8%
Other			2	2.6%	2	1.4%
Total	68	100%	77	100%	145	100%

Source: ACC Database 1/19/99

Student Enrollment, Section Counts and Average Section Size by Campus
8-Week Format Courses
Fall 1998

Student Enrollment

	Number	Percent
Enrolled in First Session Only	647	56.1% of First session enrollment
Enrolled in Both Sessions	506	43.9% of First session enrollment
First Session Enrollment	1153	58.4% of Total 8-Week session enrollment
Enrolled in Second Session Only	820	41.6% of Total 8-Week session enrollment
Total	1973	

Source: ACC Database

Section Counts

Session	Offered		Cancelled		Total
	N	%	N	%	N
First 8-Week Session	68	86.1%	11	13.9%	79
Second 8-Week Session	77	93.9%	5	6.1%	82
Total	145		16		161

Source: ACC Database

Section Counts and Average Section Size by Campus

Campus	First 8-Week Session		Second 8-Week Session		All 8-Week Sessions	
	# Sections	Avg. Size	# Sections	Avg. Size	# Sections	Avg. Size
CYP	7	13.3	9	16.1	16	14.9
ERG	2	8.0	2	6.5	4	7.3
NRG	30	20.3	29	23.2	59	21.7
PIN	10	17.2	13	19.6	23	18.6
RGC	4	27.8	4	25.3	8	26.5
RVS	12	20.8	8	22.6	20	21.6
OPC	3	11.6	12	19.0	15	17.5
Total	68	18.9	77	20.7	145	19.9

Source: ACC Database Report, 1-11-99

Grade Distribution for All First 8-Week Session Courses, Fall 1998

	A		B		C		D		F		W		I		AU		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Total all 8-week courses	743	27.3%	588	21.6%	475	17.5%	81	3.0%			506	18.6%	60	2.2%			2722
Grades by Dean Area																	
Arts & Humanities	213	24.5%	190	21.9%	167	19.2%	12	1.4%	74	8.5%	198	22.8%	11	1.3%	3	0.3%	868
Math & Science	65	27.5%	49	20.8%	34	14.4%	12	5.1%	29	12.3%	44	18.6%	3	1.3%			236
Social & Behavioral Sciences	220	20.6%	240	22.4%	210	19.6%	44	4.1%	124	11.6%	193	18.0%	39	3.6%			1070
Business	37	28.2%	41	31.3%	23	17.6%	1	0.8%	10	7.6%	19	14.5%					131
Applied Technologies	23	48.9%	5	10.6%	5	10.6%	2	4.3%	2	4.3%	10	21.3%					47
Computer Studies	185	50.0%	63	17.0%	36	9.7%	10	2.7%	24	6.5%	42	11.4%	7	1.9%	3	0.8%	370
Arts & Humanities																	
ART	10	21.7%	13	28.3%	14	30.4%			5	10.9%	3	6.5%	1	2.2%			46
DVR	5	8.8%	15	26.3%	13	22.8%	2	3.5%	4	7.0%	18	31.6%					57
DVW	10	25.6%	6	15.4%	6	15.4%	4	10.3%	5	12.8%	7	17.9%	1	2.6%			39
ENG	96	18.7%	106	20.6%	113	22.0%	2	0.4%	54	10.5%	134	26.1%	9	1.8%			514
FRN	11	37.9%	10	34.5%	3	10.3%	2	6.9%			3	10.3%					29
GER	4	16.7%	9	37.5%	4	16.7%					5	20.8%			2	8.3%	24
HUM	9	47.4%	1	5.3%	3	15.8%			3	15.8%	3	15.8%					19
SPE	38	49.4%	23	29.9%	6	7.8%			1	1.3%	9	11.7%					77
SPN	30	47.6%	7	11.1%	5	7.9%	2	3.2%	2	3.2%	16	25.4%			1	1.6%	63
Total Dean by grade	213	24.5%	190	21.9%	167	19.2%	12	1.4%	74	8.5%	198	22.8%	11	1.3%	3	0.3%	868
Math & Science																	
BIO	8	38.1%	8	38.1%	1	4.8%	1	4.8%			3	14.3%					21
DVM	17	14.0%	25	20.7%	29	24.0%	8	6.6%	16	13.2%	24	19.8%	2	1.7%			121
HKN	27	84.4%	4	12.5%							1	3.1%					32
MTH	13	21.0%	12	19.4%	4	6.5%	3	4.8%	13	21.0%	16	25.8%	1	1.6%			62
Total Dean by grade	65	27.5%	49	20.8%	34	14.4%	12	5.1%	29	12.3%	44	18.6%	3	1.3%			236

Grade Distribution for All First 8-Week Session Courses, Fall 1998 (continued)

	A		B		C		D		F		W		I		AU		Total
Social & Behavioral Sciences																	
ANT			7	30.4%	4	17.4%	1	4.3%	6	26.1%	4	17.4%	1	4.3%			23
ECO	15	22.1%	17	25.0%	13	19.1%			3	4.4%	12	17.6%	8	11.8%			68
GOV	97	19.1%	113	22.3%	113	22.3%	25	4.9%	58	11.4%	99	19.5%	2	0.4%			507
HIS	71	23.5%	74	24.5%	59	19.5%	10	3.3%	38	12.6%	44	14.6%	6	2.0%			302
PSY	27	28.7%	18	19.1%	12	12.8%	5	5.3%	15	16.0%	16	17.0%	1	1.1%			94
SOC	10	13.2%	11	14.5%	9	11.8%	3	3.9%	4	5.3%	18	23.7%	21	27.6%			76
Total Dean by grade	220	20.6%	240	22.4%	210	19.6%	44	4.1%	124	11.6%	193	18.0%	39	3.6%			1070
Business																	
ACC	18	20.9%	24	27.9%	21	24.4%			7	8.1%	16	18.6%					86
MGT	16	53.3%	11	36.7%					2	6.7%	1	3.3%					30
TRV	3	20.0%	6	40.0%	2	13.3%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%					15
Total Dean by grade	37	28.2%	41	31.3%	23	17.6%	1	0.8%	10	7.6%	19	4.5%					131
Applied Technologies																	
CAT	21	50.0%	5	11.9%	3	7.1%	2	4.8%	2	4.8%	9	21.4%					42
CDP	2	40.0%			2	40.0%					1	20.0%					5
Total Dean by grade	23	48.9%	5	10.6%	5	10.6%	2	4.3%	2	4.3%	10	21.3%					47
Computer Studies																	
CIS	150	50.3%	51	17.1%	27	9.1%	9	3.0%	20	6.7%	32	10.7%	7	2.3%	2	0.7%	298
CSC	13	52.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%			2	8.0%	6	24.0%			1	4.0%	25
EDG	19	65.5%	6	20.7%	1	3.4%			1	3.4%	2	6.9%					29
ELN	3	16.7%	4	22.2%	7	38.9%	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	2	11.1%					18
Total Dean by grade	185	50.0%	63	17.0%	36	9.7%	10	2.7%	24	6.5%	42	11.4%	7	1.9%	3	0.8%	370

Source: ACC Database Report 1-29-99

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendices

Appendix A: ***Before 8-Week Course Feedback*** **Questionnaire**

Appendix B: ***After 8-Week Course Feedback*** **Questionnaire**

Appendix C: ***ACC 8-Week Course Survey Faculty Questionnaire***

Analysis of Co- and Concurrent Enrollment for the 1996 - 1997 Academic Year

Martha Oburn, Associate Vice President, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, July 1998

Summary

This study considers data on two types of university transfer students:

- **Concurrent** students are those who take courses at both Austin Community College and a university during the same semester
- **Co-enrolled** students take courses at Austin Community College during one semester and enroll at a university at some point during the same academic year

Course-taking patterns of these students are analyzed in terms of the types of courses taken, the campuses where courses are taken, and the time of day the course is taken.

Types of Students in this Study

Austin Community College serves a significant population of students who attend four-year institutions. Some of these students enroll concurrently at both ACC and a university; others take courses at ACC during one semester, but enroll elsewhere at some point in the same academic year, either before or after they are students at ACC. Technically, these students transfer either from a university to ACC or from ACC to a university. However, for purposes of this analysis, these students were considered to be co-enrolled, since they attend more than one institution during an academic year.

ACC administrators assume that concurrent and co-enrolled students form a significant market segment for ACC. To better understand the behavior of (and address the needs of) this segment, an analysis was done to provide data on the course-taking patterns of students who take courses at ACC and either the University of Texas (UT) or Southwest Texas State University (SWT). This process began by gathering data on two groups of students: those who took courses at both ACC and either UT or SWT during the 1996-1997 academic year; and those who were enrolled at both ACC and either UT or SWT during the Fall 1996 semester. These data were provided by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. ACC then identified students in its database and determined which courses they took during this time period.

During the 1996-1997 academic year, a total of 5,837 students took at least one course at ACC and UT (Table 1). Of these, 4,103 or 70.1% attended ACC in the Summer term. Unlike UT students, SWT students did not significantly increase their course-taking at ACC during the summer term. Of the 1,638 SWT students who also attended ACC during the academic year, 772 students, or about half (47.1%) took at least one class in the summer. (Demographic data on these students are available in Attachment C.)

Table 1

Number of Concurrent and Co-Enrolled Students by Term

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

University	Total Co-enrolled AY 1996	Students Enrolled at ACC			Total Concurrent Fall 1996
		Fall 1996	**Spring 1997**	**Summer 1997**	
University of Texas at Austin	5,837	1,656	1,318	4,103	620
Southwest Texas State University	1,638	743	623	772	272

Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

During the Fall 1996 semester, only 620 UT students and 272 SWT students were also taking courses at ACC. This suggests that students tend to enroll at only one institution during a specific term. For example, students may be taking courses at ACC in the fall in order to transfer into UT or SWT in the Spring term.

The next part of the analysis consisted of acquiring information on ACC courses these students were taking. For each group, student ID numbers were compared to the ACC semester data base. In this way, it was possible to analyze the number and types of courses these students are taking. For purposes of this project, all courses in which students were enrolled were counted.

On an annual basis, individual UT students took slightly fewer courses than individual SWT students, 2.63 compared to 2.82 (Table 2). Both groups averaged more courses in the Fall term than Spring or Summer. UT students averaged nearly three courses in the Fall term but only two courses in the summer, while SWT students averaged about two and a half courses in the Fall, but less than 2 courses in the Summer. Concurrent students at both averaged a little over one course in the Fall 1996 term.

Table 2

Average Number of Courses Taken by Concurrent and Co-Enrolled Students

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

University	Co-enrolled AY 1996	Enrolled at ACC			Concurrent Fall 1996
		Fall 1996	**Spring 1997**	**Summer 1997**	
University of Texas at Austin	2.63	2.61	2.14	2.00	1.23
Southwest Texas State University	2.82	2.48	2.27	1.76	1.31

Source: ACC Student Database

Patterns of Concurrently Enrolled Students

During the Fall 1996 term, only 10.6% of the UT students and 16.6% of the SWT students were taking courses at ACC during the same term they were enrolled at the university. Of these concurrent enrollees, UT students were enrolled predominantly at the Rio Grande Campus (43.5%). Nearly one-fifth took courses at the Northridge Campus and about one-tenth at Riverside. SWT students were more dispersed, with about one-fifth of the course enrollments at Riverside, 17.1% at Rio Grande, and 15. 2% at the Pinnacle. Another 13.4% enrolled at Northridge. In addition, 17.6% of the enrollments were at an Open Campus site, probably San Marcos High School, which is located near the SWT campus.

The disciplines with the highest enrollments for concurrently enrolled UT students included government, history, mathematics, Spanish, biology and chemistry. SWT concurrent enrollments were highest in the areas of mathematics, Spanish, and English.

Table 3

Course Enrollment of Concurrent ACC Students by Campus

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

University	CYP	ERG	NRG	PIN	RGC	RVS	DIS	OP	TOT
UT Students	29	22	153	22	366	92	100	57	841
Percent	3.4%	2.6%	18.2%	2.6%	43.5%	10.9%	11.9%	6.8%	
SWT Students	15	17	51	58	65	80	28	67	381
Percent	3.9%	4.5%	13.4%	15.2%	17.1%	21.0%	7.3%	17.6%	
Total	44	39	204	80	431	172	128	124	1,222
Percent	3.6%	3.2%	16.7%	6.5%	35.3%	14.1%	10.5%	10.2%	

Source: ACC Database

Patterns of Co-Enrolled UT Students

In all the 5,837 co-enrolled UT students took 15, 351 courses during the 1996 Academic Year. Nearly 40 percent of these courses were taken at the Rio Grande Campus (See Table 4).

The Northridge Campus accounted for about one-fifth of the enrollments, while 15.6% of the courses were taken through some form of Distance Learning format. The Riverside Campus had nearly 15% of the course enrollments, with all other campuses combined having only about 10 percent of the total course enrollments.

Table 4

Course Enrollment of Co-Enrolled ACC and UT Students by Campus

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

Term	CYP	ERG	NRG	PIN	RGC	RVS	DIS	OP	TOT
Fall 1996	157	70	881	202	1,785	651	458	126	4,330
Spring 1997	77	54	542	110	1,133	463	334	112	2,825
Summer 1997	141	117	1,567	237	3,165	1,166	1,605	198	8,196
Total	375	241	2,990	549	6,083	2,280	2,397	436	15,351
Percent	2.4%	1.6%	19.5%	3.6%	39.6%	14.9%	15.6%	2.8%	

Source: ACC Database

Four courses, Texas and U. S. Government and U.S. History I and II, accounted for over 25% of the student enrollment in courses. Nearly 10% of the course enrollments were in Spanish I though IV. In these areas, most of the enrollments were in the Summer term. Other subject areas that had significant enrollment included mathematics, physics, chemistry, computers, and English literature and composition. (See Table 5) Enrollment for specific courses varied by semester, with introductory courses in the sciences, philosophy, psychology and mathematics having significant enrollment in the fall and summer terms, and areas like accounting and economics showing increased enrollment during the summer.

Distance learning enrollment were highest in the summer term. Along with history and government, courses with the highest enrollment included Biology 1603 and1613, Economics 1623 and 1633, English 1613, 1623, and 2713, and Psychology 1613.

Table 5

High Enrollment Courses of Co-Enrolled ACC and UT Students by Course

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
GOV2623–TEXAS	215	158	861	1234
GOV2613–U.S.	177	133	748	1058
HIS1623–U.S. II	149	114	776	1039
HIS1613–U.S. I	154	108	673	935
SPN2613–SPANISH III	65	56	302	423
SPN3623–SPANISH IV	49	64	305	418
SPN1625–SPANISH II	78	93	176	347
SPN1615–SPANISH I	118	57	135	310
PHY2624–ENGR PHYSICS II	64	42	186	292
ENG1623–COMP II	68	51	152	271
ENG1613–COMP I	49	46	174	269
HKN1601 (All sections)	101	68	71	240
ENG2713–LIT I	66	38	128	232
MTH1513–SPIRIT&USE	87	48	91	226
MTH1743–ALGEBRA	98	65	46	209
CHM1644–CHM II	65	50	90	205
PHY1624–GEN PHYSICS II	42	32	126	200
PHY2614–ENGR PHYSICS I	56	36	100	192
ECO1623–MICRO	53	29	106	188
CHM1634–CHEM I	70	36	68	174
PSY1613–INTRO	77	40	57	174
Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
MTH1684–BUS CALC II	22	28	123	173
PHY1614–GEN PHYSICS I	50	36	78	164
ECO1633–MACRO	44	27	80	151
BIO1654–CELL/MOLECULAR	47	40	52	139
MTH1674–BUS CALC I	25	29	69	123

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
MTH1674–BUS CALC I	25	29	69	123
CIS1003–INTRO	45	32	39	116
ACC1623–FINANCE	23	17	74	114
ACC1633–PRIN	23	10	81	114
BIO1673–GENERAL	54	20	37	111
CHM2624–ORGANIC II	34	24	52	110
BIO1603–LIFE ON EARTH	22	14	69	105
CHM2614–ORGANIC I	38	28	36	102
BIO2714–ANATOMY	32	26	42	100
PHL1613–INTRO	52	18	29	99
SOC1613–INTRO	40	26	30	96
CIS2003–C++	27	18	51	96
CIS1033–PASCAL	31	25	39	95
CSC1003–INTRO	39	20	34	93
MTH1643-BUS & ECON	34	22	36	92
MTH2164–DIFF EQUATIONS	33	14	44	91
BIO2724–HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY	22	11	58	91
BIO1613–LIVING PLANET	22	7	58	87
MTH1854–CALC I	29	26	31	86
MTH156[illegible]STAT	22	14	48	84
ACC2013–STATISTICS	13	7	54	74
MTH1864–CALC II	28	18	22	68
MTH1523–MATH I	11	10	44	65

Patterns of Co-Enrolled SWT Students

The 4,612 students who took courses at ACC and SWT at some point during the academic year were dispersed among the campuses. Northridge, Riverside, and Rio Grande each had about one-fifth of the enrollments, while the Pinnacle and Open Campus each had about a tenth. More SWT students were enrolled in the Fall and Spring terms than in the Summer. (See Table 6)

Table 6

Course Enrollment of Co-Enrolled ACC and SWT Students by Campus

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

Term	CYP	ERG	NRG	PIN	RGC	RVS	DIS	OP	TOT
Fall 1996	94	35	446	227	352	402	115	175	1,846
Spring 1997	88	18	284	162	270	306	92	195	1,415
Summer 1997	41	4	328	94	304	273	130	177	1,351
Total	223	57	1,058	483	926	981	337	547	4,612
Percent	4.8%	1.2%	22.9%	10.5%	20.1%	21.3%	7.3%	11.9%	

Source: ACC Database

SWT students were not as focused as UT students in their course-taking. MTH1743–College Algebra, PHI1613–Introduction to Philosophy, and GOV2623–Texas Government had over 150 enrollments each. Other courses with over 100 enrollments included ECO1623, ENG1623, GOV2613, MTH1643, SPN1615.

Moreover, SWT students enrolled in some specific courses not taken by significant numbers of UT students. These included MTH1643–Bus and Econ, ACC1233 and ACC1623, BIO1814–Botany, and Developmental Mathematics.

Enrollment in distance learning courses was not significant for SWT students.

Table 7

High Enrollment Courses of Co-Enrolled ACC and SWT Students by Course

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
MTH1743–ALGEBRA	65	54	86	205
HKN1601 (All sections)	48	63	59	170
PHL1613–INTRO	75	51	40	166
GOV2613–U.S.	59	41	54	154
GOV2623–TEXAS	71	35	43	149
SPE1603–INTRO SPEECH	31	50	67	148
HIS1623–U.S. II	49	41	51	141
SPN1615–SPANISH I	52	45	30	127
ECO1623–MICRO	41	31	54	126
ENG1623–COMP II	46	41	38	125

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
MTH1643–BUS & ECON	48	24	30	102
CHM1634–CHEM I	32	34	24	90
SPN1625–SPANISH II	22	40	26	88
ACC1623–FINANCE	34	22	30	86
HIS1613–U.S. I	24	29	31	84
ECO1633–MACRO	27	24	32	83
PHY1614–GEN PHYSICS I	18	28	24	70
ACC1633–PRIN	27	15	27	69
CHM1644–CHEM II	16	14	36	66
BIO1673–GENERAL	31	18	16	65
PSY1613–INTRO	26	19	14	59
CIS1003–INTRO	26	25	7	58
SOC1613–INTRO	27	20	9	56
CSC1003–INTRO	26	12	16	54
ENG2713–LIT I	22	7	23	52
ENG1613–COMP I	17	23	11	51
MTH1674–BUS CALC I	16	10	20	46
PHY1624–GEN PHYSICS II	22	14	10	46
BIO1654–CELL/MOLECULAR	16	14	16	46
DVM–INTERMED ALGEBRA	14	17	8	39
BIO1714–ANATOMY	20	11	7	38
MTH1563–STAT	14	15	8	37
BIO1824–ZOOLOGY	20	10	7	37
SPN3623–SPANISH IV	11	7	18	36
SPN2613–SPANISH III	8	5	21	34
ENG2653–WORLD LIT	18	4	9	31
DVM–ELEM ALGEBRA	14	9	6	29
BIO1814–BOTANY	22	6		28
CIS1023–VISUAL BASIC	12	8	3	23
CIS2003–C++	10	6	4	20

Time of Day

Course enrollments from both UT and SWT students suggest that students take courses at all times of the day. Students are somewhat more likely to enroll in the morning than afternoon or evening, but about one-third take courses that ran between 12:00 and 4:00 p.m. Contrary to previous assumptions, less than half of these students took morning courses.

Table 8

UT Course Enrollments by Time of Day

Fall 1996

Time of Day	CYP	ERG	NRG	PIN	RGC	RVS	TOT	%
Morning (7 a.m. - Noon)	66	344	338	66	644	262	1,720	42.5%
Afternoon (Noon - 4 p.m.)	54	18	314	87	643	242	1,358	33.6%
Evening (4 p.m. - 10 p.m.)	37	18	219	49	497	146	966	23.9%

Source: ACC Database

Table 9

SWT Course Enrollments by Time of Day

Fall 1996

Time of Day	CYP	ERG	NRG	PIN	RGC	RVS	TOT	%
Morning (7 a.m. - Noon)	32	7	181	95	135	165	615	39.6%
Afternoon (Noon - 4 p.m.)	35	7	152	77	121	141	533	34.3%
Evening (4 p.m. - 10 p.m.)	26	21	112	55	96	96	406	26.1%

Source: ACC Database

In the Fall 1997, 35.7% of courses offered were in the morning, 31.0% were in the afternoon, and 33.3% were in the evening hours. While slightly more than one-third of class sections were offered in the morning, Fall 1996 morning enrollment of UT students was 42.5% and for SWT students was 39.6%. When morning and afternoon courses are considered together, two-thirds of courses (66.7%) were offered during these times. However, 76.1% of UT students and 73.9% of SWT students enrolled during these times.

There are two possible explanations for these observations. It is possible that UT and SWT students may be more likely to enroll in the morning and afternoon for unrelated personal reasons. If this is in fact the case, ACC could respond by increasing the number of transfer courses offered during these times and reducing the evening offerings of transfer courses.

Alternatively, if not enough transfer courses are being offered in the evening hours, UT and SWT students would be discouraged from enrolling during those times. This would force co-enrolled students to enroll for morning and afternoon courses that are transferable, even if their natural

preference would be to enroll for evening classes. This problem could be solved through more even distribution of the course times for transfer courses commonly enrolled in by UT and SWT students, such as Government and History. ACC should conduct further analysis to determine which of these presumptions is most accurate and use the results of that investigation to guide future course time decisions.

Summary Observations:

- UT students take courses primarily in the summer. ACC should determine if this is a policy issue (written or *de facto*) at UT.
- SWT students take fewer courses in the summer. Some of these students attend classes at the San Marcos site, where summer courses offerings are limited. An analysis of possible additional offerings at this site may increase the number of SWT students attending in the summer. This could be accomplished by surveying fall and spring students to determine what other courses they might take.
- High numbers of enrollments in distance learning courses may be the result of closed high demand courses. Efforts should be made to ensure that sections of high demand courses are offered at appropriate times and locations for these students.
- Taskforces should conduct periodic reviews their course content and ensure that the curriculum meets the transfer requirements of UT and SWT.
- Enrollments in specific courses, such as Government and History, probably reflect different transfer policies. Additionally, recent legislation regarding the core curriculum for Texas universities will impact transferability of courses. ACC should continue to maintain communications with both universities to ensure course offerings in transferable courses.
- The impact of the legislatively mandated 42-hour transfer curriculum is not known. The potential impact should be analyzed as ACC implements this requirement. It may be possible to expand the number of courses that will easily transfer. These courses need to be identified and scheduled at times UT and SWT students can take them.
- While somewhat more students enroll in courses that meet in the morning than in the afternoon or evening, UT and SWT students do take classes at all times of day. ACC should conduct further analysis to establish the reasons for this and should work to ensure that appropriate numbers of transfer classes are being offered when UT and SWT students are most likely to enroll.

Attachment A

High Enrollment Courses of Co-Enrolled ACC and UT Students by Discipline Sorted by Course Title

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
ACC1623–FINANCE	23	17	74	114
ACC1633–PRIN	23	10	81	114
ACC2013–STATISTICS	13	7	54	74
BIO1603–LIFE ON EARTH	22	14	69	105
BIO1613–LIVING PLANET	22	7	58	87
BIO1654–CELL/MOLECULAR	47	40	52	139
BIO1673–GENERAL	54	20	37	111
BIO2714–ANATOMY	32	26	42	100
BIO2724–HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY	22	11	58	91
CHM1634–CHEM I	70	36	68	174
CHM1644–CHEM II	65	50	90	205
CHM2614–ORGANIC I	38	28	36	102
CHM2624–ORGANIC II	34	24	52	110
CIS1003–INTRO	45	32	39	116
CIS1033–PASCAL	31	25	39	95
CIS2003–C++	27	18	51	96
CSC1003–INTRO	39	20	34	93
ECO1623–MICRO	53	29	106	188
ECO1633–MACRO	44	27	80	151
ENG1613–COMP I	49	46	174	269
ENG1623–COMP II	68	51	152	271
ENG2713–LIT I	66	38	128	232
GOV2613–U.S.	177	133	748	1058
GOV2623–TEXAS	215	158	861	1234
HIS1613–U.S. I	154	108	673	935
HIS1623–U.S. II	149	114	776	1039
HKN1601 (All sections)	101	68	71	240

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
MTH1513–SPIRIT&USE	87	48	91	226
MTH1523–MATH I	11	10	44	65
MTH1563–STAT	22	14	48	84
MTH1643–BUS & ECON	34	22	36	92
MTH1674–BUS CALC I	25	29	69	123
MTH1684–BUS CALC II	22	28	123	173
MTH1743–ALGEBRA	98	65	46	209
MTH1854-CALC I	29	26	31	86
MTH1864-CALC II	28	18	22	68
MTH2164–DIFF EQUATIONS	33	14	44	91
PHL1613–INTRO	52	18	29	99
PHY1614–GEN PHYSICS I	50	36	78	164
PHY1624–GEN PHYSICS II	42	32	126	200
PHY2614–ENGR PHYSICS I	56	36	100	192
PHY2624–ENGR PHYSICS II	64	42	186	292
PSY1613–INTRO	77	40	57	174
SOC1613–INTRO	40	26	30	96
SPN1615–SPANISH I	118	57	135	310
SPN1625–SPANISH II	78	93	176	347
SPN2613–SPANISH III	65	56	302	423
SPN3623–SPANISH IV	49	64	305	418

Source: A.C.C. Database

Attachment B

High Enrollment Courses of Co-Enrolled ACC and SWT Students by Discipline Sorted by Course Title

Academic Year 1996 - 1997

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
ACC1623–FINANCE	34	22	30	86
ACC1633–PRIN	27	15	27	69
BIO1654–CELL/MOLECULAR	16	14	16	46
BIO1673–GENERAL	31	18	16	65
BIO1714–ANATOMY	20	11	7	38
BIO1814–BOTANY	22	6		28
BIO1824-ZOOLOGY	20	10	7	37
CHM1634–CHEM I	32	34	24	90
CHM1644–CHEM II	16	14	36	66
CIS1003–INTRO	26	25	7	58
CIS1023–VISUAL BASIC	12	8	3	23
CIS2003–C++	10	6	4	20
CSC1003–INTRO	26	12	16	54
DVM–ELEM ALGEBRA	14	9	6	29
DVM–INTERMED ALGEBRA	14	17	8	39
ECO1623–MICRO	41	31	54	126
ECO1633–MACRO	27	24	32	83
ENG1613–COMP I	17	23	11	51
ENG1623–COMP II	46	41	38	125
ENG2653–WORLD LIT	18	4	9	31
ENG2713–LIT I	22	7	23	52
GOV2613–U.S.	59	41	54	154
GOV2623–TEXAS	71	35	43	149
HIS1613–U.S. I	24	29	31	84
HIS1623–U.S. II	49	41	51	141
HKN1601 (All Sections)	48	63	59	170

Course	Fall 1996	Spring 1997	Summer 1997	Total
MTH1563–STAT	14	15	8	37
MTH1643–BUS & ECON	48	24	30	102
MTH1674–BUS CALC I	16	10	20	46
MTH1743–ALGEBRA	65	54	86	205
PHL1613–INTRO	75	51	40	166
PHY1614–GEN PHYSICS I	18	28	24	70
PHY1624–GEN PHYSICS II	22	14	10	46
PSY1613–INTRO	26	19	14	59
SOC1613–INTRO	27	20	9	56
SPE1603–INTRO SPEECH	31	50	67	148
SPN1615–SPANISH I	52	45	30	127
SPN1625–SPANISH II	22	40	26	88
SPN2613–SPANISH III	8	5	21	34
SPN3623–SPANISH IV	11	7	18	36

Source: A.C.C. Database

Attachment C

Demographic Analysis of Co-and Concurrently Enrolled Students

Attending 1996 - 1997

	Co-Enrolled Students		Concurrent Students	
	UT	SWT	UT	SWT
Average Age (years)	22.5	24.9	24.5	27.1
Male (%)	44.9	38.5	38.4	34.9
Female (%)	55.1	61.5	61.6	65.1
White (%)	68.6	76.0	73.4	77.3
Black (%)	3.0	3.9	3.4	4.3
Hispanic (%)	12.8	15.1	13.1	13.8
Asian (%)	11.9	3.5	8.2	2.2
American Indian (%)	0.5	0.6	0.0	1.0
International (%)	3.2	0.8	1.8	1.4

Source: A.C.C. Database.

Attachment D

Semester Credit Hours Taken by Co-and Concurrently Enrolled Students

Attending 1996-1997

	Co-Enrolled Students		Concurrent Students	
	UT	SWT	UT	SWT
Hours Attempted	19.5	26.6	26.3	29.8
Hours Earned	19.4	26.0	26.1	29.1

Source: ACC Database.

Note: Reflects all courses ever taken through Spring 1998.

Attachment E

Degrees Earned by Co-and Concurrently Enrolled Students

Attending 1996-1997

	Co-Enrolled Students		Concurrent Students	
	UT	**SWT**	**UT**	**SWT**
A.A.	18	9	2	
A.S.	25	9	6	1
A.A.S.	8	9	1	2
Certificate		2		

Source: ACC Database.

Note: Reflects all degrees earned through Spring 1998